

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Examiner's Answer. Entry of the present amendment and allowance of the present application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

Claim 13 has been added.

In response to the rejection of claims 1-4, 7 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 102, as being anticipated by Reddy (US6175355), Applicant traverses the rejection because the PWM modulation of the pixels in Reddy, that have a time average sum substantially equal to the overall brightness, do not have a non-zero brightness.

The citation does not disclose "display pixels (3) of said at least one subset (S) have at least a light output (L) at a first non-zero brightness level (L1) during a first sub-period (F1) of said frame period (F) and at a second non-zero brightness level (L2) during a second sub-period (F2) of said frame period (F), the time averaged sum of said brightness levels (L1,L2) being substantially equal to said overall brightness level." as in claim 1 of the application. Claims 2-4, 7 and 12 are dependent on claim 12 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons.

In response to the rejection of claims 5, 6, and 11 a under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of the obvious combination of Ready and Koyama (US6828950), Applicant traverses the rejection because the control of the brightness of the pixels in Koyama do not provide a time average sum substantially equal to the overall brightness do not have a non-zero brightness.

The combination of citations does not disclose "display pixels (3) of said at least one subset (S) have at least a light output (L) at a first non-zero brightness level (L1) during a first sub-period (F1) of said frame period (F) and at a second non-zero

brightness level (L2) during a second sub-period (F2) of said frame period (F), the time averaged sum of said brightness levels (L1,L2) being substantially equal to said overall brightness level." as in claim 1 of the application. Claims 5, 6 and 11 are dependent on claim 1 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons.

In response to the rejection of claims 9-10 a under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of the obvious combination of Ready and Yamazaki (US7145536), Applicant traverses the rejection because the control of the brightness of the pixels in Koyama do not provide a time average sum substantially equal to the overall brightness do not have a non-zero brightness.

The combination of citations does not disclose " display pixels (3) of said at least one subset (S) have at least a light output (L) at a first non-zero brightness level (L1) during a first sub-period (F1) of said frame period (F) and at a second non-zero brightness level (L2) during a second sub-period (F2) of said frame period (F), the time averaged sum of said brightness levels (L1,L2) being substantially equal to said overall brightness level." as in claim 1 of the application. Claims 9-10 are dependent on claim 1 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Please charge any fee deficiencies and credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Michael E. Belk/
Michael E. Belk, Reg. 33,357
Senior Intellectual Property Counsel
(914) 333-9643